

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 19, and 21 are pending.

Claims 5, 10, 13-18, and 20 are cancelled.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 19, and 21 are rejected.

Claim 1 is amended to recite the following features: a) to recite that a user entered in text string is used to the basis of a search (see the specification, page 5, lines 24 to page 6, line 19), b) to recite that a search result may match two different programs with different program titles (see the specification page 6, lines 6-19 where both "Home and Garden" and "Home Improvement" are matched to the term "Home"), c) where a search result is matched against both a program title and program descriptive information (see the specification on page 6, line 20 to page 7, line 11, and page 13, lines 15 to 21), and d) and the further sending of e-mails until the search is terminated (see page 13, lines 15 to 21). The specification also identifies that in the environment the invention operates, the program guide information is updated periodically (see page 10, lines 7-17).

Claim 2 is amended as the idea of television program descriptive text has been included into amended Claim 1.

Claim 4 is amended to be consistent with Claim 1.

Claim 10 is cancelled as Claim 1 pretty much is similar to Claim 1, and to help simplify the issues of the present invention. That is, the Claim 10 and Claim 1 are nearly identical the Applicants have decided to pursue Claim 1 over Claim 10.

Claim 11 is amended in the same manner as Claim 1 above.

Claim 12 is amended, as the introduction program descriptive text is incorporated into amended Claim 11.

No new matter is entered into application in view of these amendments.

1. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 19, and 21

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Alten et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,396,546, hereafter referred to as 'Alten') and in further view of Morrison et al (U.S. Patent # 6,591,292, hereafter referred to as 'Morrison'). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

As amended, Claim 1 (as with Claim 11) claims several different features which are neither disclosed nor suggested in Alten with Morrison, alone or in combination with each other.

A. Claim 1, as amended, claims that a search is performed in data representing a channel guide list and data representing program descriptive text. The basis of the search is performed in view of a user entered in "text string". Both Alten and Morrison do not disclose or suggest that a user entered in "text string" is used as the basis of a search through program listings. The closest both references come is the reminder feature provided in Alten, where a program reminder is shown for a selected program. The selected program is not searched in the same way as a text string by a user, because the user in Alten actually selects a program for a reminder (see Alten, col. 18, lines 19-35).

This is different than what is performed in Claim 1, in that the system of the present invention provides a different manner to find programming. That is, a search string is used as the basis of a search, where the result of the search results at least two different programs where two of the television programs have different program titles. This type of result is neither disclosed nor suggested in Alten with Morrison, alone or in combination.

B. As referred to above, the result of a search performed in the present invention is to return television shows that are different, where a search term is used to return a television program using the title information associated with that show, and a second television program using the program descriptive information associated with that show. Both Alten and Morrison require a user to specifically select a program in order for something to be done; where a television program is specifically identified by a user. In contrast, the present invention with "search" different program data to find programs that match a particular term, where the information searched in not limited to what is shown in an electronic program guide (see for example Morrison, col. 14, lines 24-54 where an EPG is used to select a particular television show). That is, a user does not have to hunt through EPG listings to find a relevant show that matches a particular text string. This claimed feature is neither disclosed nor suggested in Alten and Morrison, alone or in combination.

C. Claim 1 as amended will keep on e-mailing a user program listings that match the search text string, until such a feature is turned off. This feature in neither disclosed or suggested in Morrison and Alten, alone or in combination.

At best, Morrison is a system that discloses that program guide listing information may be e-mailed to a user. That program guide listing information however has to specifically be selected a priori in order to be delivered in an e-mail. That is, when Morrison combined with Alten, the disclosed system would be suggestive that only one e-mail for a selected program would be delivered to a user, because a particular program has to be selected by a user before the information of such a program are e-mailed to a user.

In contrast, the present invention is geared towards allowing a search be run continuously as to consider new program listings that have information that matches such a search result. That is, the user running the present invention can discover any new television shows that have a

program listing or descriptive information that matches a particular term (as program guide information is consistently updated in the present invention). Therefore, over time, more program listings are discovered, and such program listing information will be consistently e-mailed to a user until disabled.

Even if it could be suggested that the system of Alten and Morrison would or could send multiple e-mails, which the Applicants do not think is the case, the results of such multiple e-mails would be the same program title for television shows shown at different times. The present invention is to help a user identify television programs with different program titles, whereby the only related thing for such television programs is that they are matched with a search term that is a text string. Hence, different program titles are sent to a user until such a search is disabled.

For the reasons given above for Claim 1 and which pertain to Claim 11, Applicants assert that the present invention is distinguished over the present art of record. Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to these claims. In addition, Applicants assert that Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 19 and Claims 12 and 21 are patentable; as such claims depend on Claims 1 and 11, respectively. Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to these claims, as well.

Applicants believe that no fees are owed in connection with this action. If such fees are owed however, please charge Deposit Account 07-0832.

It is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joel M. Fogelson/
By: Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43, 613
Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
Two Independence Way
Suite 2
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
September 17, 2007